



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,205	08/02/2005	Andreas Kohl	PC10496US	9988
23122	7590	08/16/2010	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			IRVIN, THOMAS W	
P.O. BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482			PAPER NUMBER	
			3657	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			08/16/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 29 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that Newton et al. does not monitor the hydraulic flowrate of the pump, the examiner points to points to the abstract which clearly states "Further, the flow rate may be corrected to the desired rate".

In response to applicant's argument regarding claims 16 and 23 and determining the electromotive force, the examiner points to page 5 lines 18-20 of the Final Office action mailed 08 June 2010 which states that out that electromotive force has a measurement in volts, which Newton et al. discloses (col. 2, line 61 – col. 3, line 9).

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claims 17 and 24, the examiner points to page 4 lines 7-13 of the Final Office action mailed 08 June 2010 which states that regarding claims 17, Hofsaess et al., as modified, do not disclose the monitoring of the power consumption of the motor to determine the hydraulic delivery rate, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to monitor the power consumption to determine the hydraulic delivery rate instead of monitoring the voltage. The examiner notes that power consumption and voltage are proportionally related, and one of ordinary skill in the art would choose what to monitor based on convenience.

In response to applicant's arguments that no regarding claims 18 and 25, the examiner points to page 6 lines 1-3 of the Final Office action mailed 08 June 2010 which states that in response to applicant's argument regarding determining the

Art Unit: 3657

rotational speed of the pump, the examiner points to col. 5, lines 5-9 of Hofsaess et al.,
and col. 2, line 61 – col. 3, line 9 of Newton et al.